

Re Box No. V

IAPS Rec'd PCT/PTO 24 FEB 2006

In the present opinion, reference is made to the following document:

D1: EP-A-1 056 256 (SIEMENS INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION NETWORKS INC; RADVISION LTD) 29 November 2000 (2000-11-29)

1. The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of claim 1 is not based on an inventive step as defined in Article 33(3) PCT.

Document D1 is regarded as the nearest prior art in relation to the subject matter of claim 1. It discloses (the references in parentheses relate to this document) *a method for controlling a media gateway via which a plurality of subscribers and/or trunk lines H.323 client terminal which is brought to at least two media gateway controllers gatekeepers* (cf. paragraphs [0006] and [0007], wherein *registering with the at least two media gateway controllers gatekeepers is carried out simultaneously by the media gateway client terminal* (cf. paragraph [0007], second sentence), *as a result of which at least two packet-based signaling connections are established* (cf. column 3, lines 50-52) *but only one of them is activated in switching terms, in accordance with a selection criterion, for the same plurality of subscribers and trunk lines* (cf. paragraph [0007], last sentence).

The subject matter of claim 1 therefore differs from this known method in that it restricts itself to a media gateway having two media gateway controllers instead of an H.323 client terminal having two gatekeepers.

However, document D1 solves a similar problem to claim 1 (cf. paragraph [0005]) and notes (cf. paragraph [0010]) that the disclosed method can also be applied to the MGCP protocol (MGCP = "Media Gateway Control Protocol"). It is therefore obvious to the average person skilled in the art to adapt the disclosed method accordingly in order to solve the problem in the MGCP context and therefore arrive at a method

according to claim 1. The subject matter of claim 1 is therefore not based on an inventive step Article 33(3) PCT.

2. The dependent claims 2-11 include no additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, meet the requirements of the PCT with regard to inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT), because these additional features relate to obvious measures which the average person skilled in the art would take without inventive effort in accordance with the circumstances.